

1 THE HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
12 AT SEATTLE  
13  
14

15 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
16  
17 Plaintiff,  
18  
19 v.  
20  
21 ELMER J. BUCKARDT, et al.,  
22  
23 Defendants.  
24

25 CASE NO. 2:19-CV-52-RAJ  
26  
ORDER

16 This matter comes before the Court on Defendants Elmer J. Buckardt and Karen A.  
17 Buckardt's (collectively, "Defendants") "Motion to extend date of summon [sic] in civil  
18 action" ("Motion"). Dkt. # 4. Defendants' Motion, filed February 25, 2019, is a one-  
19 sentence motion that reads in full: "On February 20, 2019 defendants are requesting a  
20 motion to extend summon [sic] in a civil action for 30 days." *Id.* Plaintiff United States of  
21 America ("Plaintiff") opposed the Motion a day after it was filed, contending that it was  
22 premature as of that date because Plaintiff had not yet served Defendants. Dkt. # 8.  
23

24 It is not clear what date Defendants request that this Court extend. If the date is the  
25 service deadline for Plaintiff, then Defendants' motion is unnecessary, as they were  
26 already served on March 13, 2019. Dkt. ## 13-15. If Defendants request an extension of

1 their own deadline to file a responsive pleading to Plaintiff's Complaint, then this Motion  
2 is also unnecessary at this time, as Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss on March 11,  
3 2019. Dkt. # 12.

4 Accordingly, given the vagueness of Defendants' request and the lack of necessity  
5 for extension of the service deadline at this time, the Court **DENIES WITHOUT**  
6 **PREJUDICE** Defendants' Motion. Dkt. # 4.

7  
8 DATED this 28th day of March, 2019.

9  
10   
11 The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
12 United States District Judge